

Digital Discourse Forensics: The Configuration of Hate Speech in The Instagram Interaction Space of Bobby Nasution's Account

Siti Mahmudah^{a*}, Yunita Suryani^b, Lailatul Afifah^c

^{a,b,c}Universitas PGRI Ronggolawe, Jl. Manunggal 61, Tuban, Indonesia

e-mail: mahmudahs084@gmail.com

Abstract

This research describes the forms of hate speech in the comment section of the Instagram account @bobbynst and analyzes its legal implications through a forensic linguistic perspective. The phenomenon of the online disinhibition effect is considered to trigger the abuse of freedom of speech into massive verbal attacks that damage public space ethics. Using a qualitative descriptive method, data were collected through systematic screenshot documentation and analyzed using the identity method with orthographic identity techniques. The research results reveal an escalation of aggressive language in three main typologies: the use of taboo words, the spread of slander, and professional insults. Pejorative insults such as "TOLOL" and "babi" were found as instruments of dehumanization, as well as narratives of corruption allegations without evidence as a strategy for delegitimizing power. Forensically, these utterances indicate a malicious intent (*mens rea*) to carry out character assassination. These findings confirm that such communication patterns have strong potential to fulfill the criminal elements of defamation, insults, and provocation as regulated in the ITE Law. The study concludes that strengthening digital literacy and law enforcement based on objective linguistic evidence is crucial to maintaining the integrity and harmonization of communication on social media.

Keywords: Hate Speech; Forensic Linguistics; Social Media; Bobby Nasution; UU ITE

1. Introduction

Advances in information and communication technology have shifted society's perspective on social interaction from physical spaces to virtual ones. Physical spaces, which once served as the hub of communication, are now being supplanted by digital spaces that offer unlimited convenience, leading to a significant change in how individuals engage with one another and share information. Instagram, as one of the largest visual-based social media platforms, now functions not only as a medium for sharing lifestyles but has also transformed into a public space for discussion, expressing criticism, and even shaping political opinions regarding highly dynamic public discourse (Mulyanto et al., 2023). From a structural theory standpoint, social media has emerged as an essential instrument for public officials to promote transparency and facilitate bidirectional communication with the populace.

From the perspective of structuralism, social media is not merely a technological tool but a sociopolitical instrument that enables public officials to foster transparency and orchestrate two-way communication with their constituents. The presence of public figures on these platforms creates accessibility that breaks down the barriers of traditional bureaucracy, facilitating a direct dialogue between the government and the public. However, this ease of access also carries significant sociolinguistic risks. Such openness often clashes with the phenomenon of digital anonymity, which triggers a shift in language ethics, where constructive criticism is frequently intertwined with destructive expressions of hatred, leading to a toxic online environment that can discourage meaningful engagement and dialogue.

Just as with public figure Bobby Nasution's Instagram account, which serves as a public forum where policies are communicated and public feedback is received directly, the instant and informal nature of social media often triggers the "online disinhibition effect," a phenomenon where users feel free to express themselves without the strong moral constraints present in the real world. Freedom of speech, which should be a pillar of democracy in cyberspace, is often misinterpreted as

a license to engage in unlimited verbal attacks. Consequently, freedom of speech in the digital world is frequently abused by irresponsible individuals, leading to the emergence of toxic language, one example being hate speech.

Hate speech is a form of communication by an individual or group that takes the form of provocation, incitement, or insults directed at another individual or group (Yudarwati, 2019). In the context of politics and public leadership, social media accounts belonging to government officials are often easy targets for netizens to vent their dissatisfaction. Bobby Nasution's Instagram account, as a public figure and regional leader, has not been spared from a flood of diverse comments. Amid expressions of appreciation and constructive criticism, numerous posts contain elements of taboo language, insults, and even defamation, which constitute legal violations.

In the context of political communication and public leadership, social media accounts belonging to government officials such as Bobby Nasution's Instagram account often become arenas for identity-based disputes and targets for netizens to vent their political dissatisfaction. As a public figure and regional leader, every policy and visual representation he posts sparks a wide range of discursive reactions. However, amidst this discourse, a dangerous shift has occurred from constructive criticism toward verbal anarchy. Currently, comment sections, which originally served as a platform for public expression, have deviated from their original function; they are increasingly filled with harmful narratives and personal threats that undermine the very essence of political communication. This situation sets a poor example, where discussions and significant ideas regarding regional progress are increasingly influenced by digital voices.

There has been a proliferation of speech that explicitly contains taboo language, moral degradation, and even systematic defamation. This phenomenon aligns with the view of Davidson et al. (2017) that the use of pejorative and racist language in digital spaces constitutes a form of symbolic violence aimed at delegitimizing the subject's position in the public eye. Legally, this escalation of negative speech no longer falls within the scope of freedom of speech but has entered the realm of legal violations that potentially constitute criminal offenses under applicable regulations in Indonesia.

This phenomenon is particularly striking when it occurs on the social media accounts of local leaders with prominent political profiles. Bobby Nasution's Instagram account often serves as a representation of the complexity of interactions between leaders and the public in the digital realm. Behind the numerous expressions of appreciation for his development efforts lies a trail of communication marked by a flood of comments that no longer adhere to proper language etiquette. The language used frequently crosses the line of constructive criticism, veering into personal insults and even defamation, which carries serious legal implications.

Consequently, this phenomenon has drawn the attention of researchers to examine it through the lens of forensic linguistics. According to Olsson (2008), forensic linguistics is the relationship between language, criminal acts, and the law. Meanwhile, Suryani et al. (2021), published in the journal *Belajar Bahasa* Suryani et al., 2021, accessed via DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32528/bb.v6i1.4167>, states that forensic linguistics is a multidisciplinary field, namely the intersection of linguistics and forensic science. In this context, language is not only viewed as a means of communication but also as a piece of legal evidence that can be analyzed to determine the presence or absence of criminal intent (*mens rea*) in an utterance. In line with this, McMenamin (2002) states that the use of language in a legal context requires scientific analysis to identify the meaning contained within the linguistic structures that emerge.

It is crucial to thoroughly investigate this phenomenon because there is a need to distinguish between linguistic criminal offenses and criticism. According to Mahsun (2023), forensic linguistics holds that language is not a static system of signs but rather a piece of evidence that can provide scientific clues in the law enforcement process. In line with this, accurate linguistic analysis is

required to determine whether a statement on social media is purely an expression of freedom of speech or constitutes a criminal offense such as defamation. This identification is crucial to prevent the criminalization of public criticism while ensuring that justice is upheld based on objective linguistic criteria.

According to Saifullah (2025), the primary focus of forensic linguistics in the digital age is to examine the relationship between linguistic structure and potential legal violations in cyberspace. In a legal case involving text, language is analyzed in minute detail to determine the presence or absence of criminal intent (*mens rea*) behind a statement. Through this approach, every comment posted by netizens on Bobby Nasution's account is viewed not merely as verbal text but as linguistic evidence with legal consequences.

In line with this perspective, Datang (2023) emphasizes that forensic linguistics, as an applied discipline, requires a high degree of objectivity in identifying meaning and linguistic style. Forensic analysis allows researchers to determine whether a statement is an expression of emotional spontaneity or a structured attempt to defame someone. This identification of meaning is crucial in helping legal experts determine the status of linguistic evidence to prevent multiple interpretations. One example is the use of taboo language.

Identifying meaning through semantic and pragmatic analysis is vital in helping legal practitioners determine the status of linguistic evidence to avoid multiple interpretations that could be detrimental to one of the parties. Olsson and Luchjenbroers (2014) assert that the linguistic profile of a text message or social media comment can reveal the speaker's communicative intent. One of the main focuses in this identification is the use of taboo language. According to linguists, taboo words and profanity are not merely expressions of frustration but are often used as linguistic weapons to dehumanize others.

The context of Indonesian law, Subyantoro (2019) explains that a forensic analysis of taboo language is essential to prove the existence of defamatory elements that attack a person's honor. Without objective analysis, the use of taboo terms in social media comment sections is often dismissed as mere slang; yet, pragmatically, such speech may constitute a criminal offense under the ITE Law if proven to have the potential to damage the social reputation of the intended subject.

In Indonesia, regulations regarding hate speech are explicitly set forth in the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (EIT Law). Article 28(2) of Law No. 19 of 2016 specifically prohibits the dissemination of information intended to defame others, as well as the dissemination of information that incites hatred or hostility toward specific individuals or groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA). This underscores that every statement in the Instagram comments section carries real legal liability for the account holder who posted it. Analyzing netizens' comments on Bobby Nasution's account is crucial for mapping the types of hate speech, whether they constitute personal attacks (*ad hominem*) or unethical attacks on policies.

Several relevant previous studies on hate speech were conducted by Suryani et al. (2021) in a paper titled "Forensic Linguistics of Hate Speech Against Artist Aurel Hermansyah on Instagram," which focused on analyzing speech acts, taboo expressions, and hate speech posted by the account @mantanaurelhermansyah. Using a qualitative descriptive method with orthographic matching techniques, this study identified various types of illocutionary speech acts, including directive (asking), commissive (offering), expressive (expressing feelings), and assertive (acknowledging). The results of the study indicate the use of taboo sentences in the categories of insults, sexual harassment, and indecent acts, which lead to hate speech in the form of incitement, insults, and the dissemination of false news or slander. The perlocutionary impact of such speech triggered a negative reaction from Atta Halilintar in the form of negative comments and attempts to track down the identity of the account owner.

Meanwhile, Ningrum (2018), in her study titled “A Study of Hate Speech on Social Media,” focuses on describing the forms of hate speech on social media as well as the types of illocutionary acts found in netizens’ comments on the Facebook platform. The study found that hate speech appears across various topics, including political, social, economic, and religious issues. Based on the results of the data analysis, this study details the distribution of illocutionary act types, which include assertive acts at 32.63%, directive acts at 20.63%, commissive acts at 9.26%, expressive acts at 35.9%, and declarative acts at 1.58%.

Among these studies, a common theme is the focus on taboo speech; however, in this study, “taboo” is defined as profanity, slander, and inappropriate language posted on social media with the intent to spread negative information to a wide audience. Specifically, these taboo accusations include performance insults or defamation that can provoke the public. These actions are carried out to undermine the victim’s self-esteem and dignity in the public sphere through social media accounts.

This study, public figures were the targets of netizens’ comments, which took the form of praise, criticism, and even insults. While some of these comments used polite language, many others employed profanity. The profanity identified in this study consisted of taboo expressions. Taboo words fall into several classification categories, namely, abusive (abusive swearing), cathartic (cathartic swearing), dysphemistic (dysphemistic swearing), emphatic (emphatic swearing), and idiomatic (idiomatic swearing) (Pinker, S. 2007). In the context of the comments section on Bobby Nasution’s Instagram account, abusive swearing is predicted to be the most dominant function because it aims to personally attack and hurt the intended target through written media. Furthermore, these various categories of taboo words essentially represent speech acts that demonstrate a lack of respect toward others.

Therefore, an analysis of netizens’ comments on Bobby Nasution’s Instagram account is crucial for mapping the classification of hate speech emerging in society. This study aims to identify whether the attacks are ad hominem (personal attacks) or attacks on policies expressed using pejorative language. This research seeks to provide clear linguistic parameters so that law enforcement regarding hate speech cases on social media can be based on empirical linguistic analysis.

In conclusion, this study focuses on describing categories of hate speech and their legal implications from a forensic linguistics perspective. Although numerous studies on hate speech have been conducted, research specifically targeting local leaders such as Bobby Nasution within the context of intense local political dynamics remains limited. This study aims to describe the forms of hate speech found in the comment sections of Bobby Nasution’s Instagram account and to examine their legal implications through the lens of forensic linguistics. The results of this study are expected to provide a theoretical contribution to the development of forensic linguistics in Indonesia as well as to the advancement of language and legal studies and to serve as an educational resource for the public regarding social media etiquette and a practical contribution as a tool for legal literacy education for the public. It is intended to serve as a guide for the public to be more prudent in their use of social media.

2. Research Method

This study employs an analytical qualitative descriptive approach to provide a comprehensive overview of the configuration of hate speech in the digital space. The study focuses on an in-depth analysis of linguistic meaning without relying on statistical procedures, as well as on pragmatics to understand the online disinhibition effect phenomenon occurring on social media. The data used in this study consists of linguistic units—such as words, phrases, and sentences containing negative content—sourced directly from the comment section of the official Instagram account @bobbynst.

Data collection was conducted using a documentation method with systematic procedures.

The researcher observed posts over a specific period and took screenshots of comments that met the criteria for hate speech. To ensure data validity, each statement was analyzed by considering the circumstances or context underlying the post.

The data collection instrument in this study was the researcher himself (human instrument) as the primary collector and analyst, supported by systematically organized written data records as the determining instrument. Data analysis was conducted using the correspondence method with orthographic identity techniques. Through this technique, written linguistic units were identified and classified based on spelling systems and written forms as the primary determining factors. The researcher analyzed the data to uncover the typology of aggressive language and character assassination, which was then synthesized with a legal perspective to assess potential violations of the ITE Law.

This method enables researchers to objectively and forensically link written linguistic evidence to the subject’s criminal intent (*mens rea*)

3. Result And Discussion

This study employs a forensic linguistic approach to analyze the linguistic content in the comment section of Bobby Nasution’s Instagram account during the period of November 25–29, 2025, revealing an escalation in the use of structured negative language, ranging from the use of intense and repulsive taboo words to baseless factual accusations. Based on forensic linguistics, the study identifies attempts to delegitimize the subject through vulgar insults that attack personal dignity, as well as the dissemination of slander in the form of allegations of corruption and abuse of authority without valid supporting evidence.

In addition, attacks were also found targeting the subject’s intellectual integrity and professional credibility, aimed at damaging their reputation in the public sphere through the use of defamatory language. All of these findings reflect a pattern of digital bullying in which speakers exploit anonymity to launch character attacks that could potentially have serious legal implications regarding defamation. Analysis of the collected data revealed three main classifications of negative language use that could potentially have legal implications. The following is an analysis of hate speech occurring in the comment section of the Instagram account @bobbyst. Source: <https://www.instagram.com/bobbyst?igsh=eXZrcTIyZDV4YWtt>

Table 1. Hate Speech: Taboo Words (Swear Words or Profanity)

NO.	Comments	Category	Meaning
1.	@bahlullohya: GUBERNUR TOLOL, BODOH, IDIOT (25 November 2025)	Intense Taboo	Expressing extreme frustration and negative judgments regarding the governor’s public competence, using the most derogatory language to create a shock effect and emphasize emotional intensity. Combining vulgar insults with personal slurs, attacking the subject in ways unrelated to professional performance.
2.	@basyori5432: Gubernur laknat, cepet mati kau babi Aminnn (29 November 2025)	Personal Taboo	Referring to a lack of intelligence or an inability to think, this is classified as a personal taboo because the words used are extremely vulgar and directly attack the subject’s personal dignity. Using taboo words associated with animals to express disgust and strong rejection of the subject.
3.	@ompl_laziir: Bob bob lontemu wis mbok pakan durung (27 November 2025)	A Disgusting Taboo	Extremely belittling the subject (“Bob”) by associating him with something considered sexually taboo and treating him as if he were caring for an “animal” (feeding it) demonstrates a very high level of anger and hatred.

3.1 Forms of Hate Speech: “Taboo Words”

The first form of hate speech discussed in this article is the category of hate speech involving

taboo words in the comments section of the Instagram account @bobbynst. Taboo words are defined as linguistic units that are prohibited or avoided because they are considered to violate norms of decency and have the power to offend, demean dignity, and trigger conflict in social interactions on social media (Suryani 2021). Furthermore, from a semantic perspective, taboo words have ambiguous and unclear meanings, which lead to various assumptions among the public and can result in slander. Consequently, this often has a detrimental impact on societal norms and can lead to conflicts among people.

The following are examples of hate speech in the “taboo words” category.

Data (1)

“GUBERNUR TOLOL, BODOH, IDIOT”

sumber: @bahlullohya Posted on November 25, 2025.

The use of taboo words in the data (1) is evident in the phrase “*GUBERNUR TOLOL, BODOH, IDIOT*” which carries implicature; the use of lexical terms such as “*TOLOL, BODOH, IDIOT*” is not merely negative labeling but rather a conscious effort by the speaker to intellectually degrade the subject in order to create a shock effect in the public sphere. This word choice indicates that the speaker wishes to emphasize the subject’s lack of competence in the most demeaning way possible and to attack the subject without any relevance to their professional performance.

Data (2)

“Gubernur laknat, cepet mati kau babi Aminnnn”

Sumber: @basyori5432 Posted on November 29, 2025.

Use of Taboo Words in the Data (2) From a linguistic and forensic perspective, the statement “*Gubernur laknat, cepet mati kau babi Aminnnn*” conveys dehumanization and extreme verbal aggression intended to carry out character assassination against the subject. The pejorative use of the word “pig” serves to degrade the subject’s human dignity by equating them with an entity considered unclean in a sociocultural context, while the term “cursed” and the malicious prayer “die quickly,” reinforced by the word “Aminnnn,” convey an expressive meaning of deep hatred and a clear malicious intent (*mens rea*). This entire utterance does not represent constructive criticism, but rather a strategy of delegitimizing authority through crude insults that legally carry strong implications of criminal defamation and incitement in the digital space.

Data (3)

“Bob bob lontemu wis mbok pakan durung”

Sumber: @ompl_laziir Posted on November 27, 2025.

The use of taboo words in the data (3), language related to sexuality, such as “*lontemu,*” implies existential rejection and dehumanization of the subject. From a forensic perspective, this utterance indicates a very high level of hatred, as the speaker attempts to position the subject as an entity unworthy of social respect through language deemed repulsive and in violation of social norms. The use of such language, as seen in the comment “@ompl_laziir,” reveals overflowing anger by associating the subject with something considered sexually taboo and treating them as if they were a helpless object.

Table 2. Hate Speech, Defamation, or Slander

NO.	Comments	Category	Meaning
4.	@pikry: Gubernur gagal, gamungkin dia gatau (27 November 2025)	Corruption Charges	Serious criminal allegations (corruption) without evidence. The aim is to undermine integrity, seek social and legal consequences, and instantly damage one’s reputation; this may also constitute a potential defamation lawsuit if the accuser lacks strong evidence to support their allegations.
	@bomeh_kasep: Masih percaya kalian sama si	Allegations of Incompetence	This comment can be classified as hate speech, specifically defamation or slander. The speaker provides

5.	bobby yang hanya jadi boneka nya si monyet wkwkwkwkwk (29 November 2025)		no evidence or facts but instead uses provocative language to sway public opinion toward a negative view of Bobby Nasution.
6.	@muhziidann: gara - gara lu bob nyuruh nebanginn hutan jd skrg gausah pencitraan (27 November 2025)	Allegations of abuse of authority	This demonstrates an assertive speech act containing a serious accusation. The speaker explicitly accuses the subject of the study of being responsible for forest destruction using the phrase “ordering the felling of forests.” This statement is followed by a dysphemistic function through the word “image-building,” which aims to delegitimize the subject’s performance in the public eye. From a legal standpoint, this statement falls under the category of defamation because it attacks the subject’s personal and professional integrity without being based on valid facts.

3.2 Forms of Hate Speech: “Defamation or Slander”

Further analysis revealed that the categories of defamation and slander were the primary focus, as they carry more serious legal implications than other categories. This is due to the presence of baseless negative factual claims constructed to damage the subject’s reputation and legal credibility in the public eye. In the field of forensic linguistics, the implicatures that emerge in this category are particularly dangerous because they directly attack personal and professional integrity through provocative narratives.

The following are examples of hate speech in the category of “defamation or slander.”

Data (4)

“Gubernur gagal, gamungkin dia gatau”

Sumber: @pikry Posted on November 27, 2025.

Expressions of defamation or slander in the data (4): One significant finding is the emergence of corruption allegations that are subtly yet sharply implied. For example, the use of the phrase *“Gubernur gagal, gamungkin dia gatau”* implies the subject’s involvement in a serious irregularity or crime. The speaker deliberately steers public opinion to believe there is a criminal motive behind the subject’s policies, which legally could potentially lead to a defamation lawsuit if the speaker lacks strong material evidence. Forensically, this delegitimization strategy indicates an attempt at character assassination through implicature techniques deliberately designed to undermine the subject’s professional integrity without explicitly leveling accusations.

Data (5)

“Masih percaya kalian sama si bobby yang hanya jadi boneka nya si monyet wkwkwkwkwk”

Sumber: @bomeh_kasep Posted on November 29, 2025.

Allegations of defamation or slander in the data (5) In addition to corruption allegations, the use of the *“boneka”* metaphor emerged as a dominant strategy for delegitimizing authority in the comment section. Implicitly, this choice of words gives the impression that the subject lacks sovereignty, independence, or integrity in decision-making as a public leader. By referring to the subject as a *“boneka”* controlled by others, the speaker seeks to undermine the subject’s authority and create an image of incompetence in the eyes of the general public.

Data (6)

“gara - gara lu bob nyuruh nebanginn hutan jd skrg gausah pencitraan”

Sumber: @muhziidann Posted on November 27, 2025.

Allegations of defamation or slander in the data (6) Further analysis revealed specific accusations regarding abuse of authority, such as the statement *“nyuruh nebangin hutan”*. This statement constitutes a form of assertive speech containing slander, as it accuses the subject of environmental damage without valid evidence. The speaker employs this strategy to directly attack the

subject’s credibility, shifting public perception from initially positive to suspicion regarding the subject’s professional integrity.

Finally, these attacks are reinforced by the use of dysphemistic terminology, such as the word *"pencitraan"* which aims to delegitimize the subject’s actual performance. The implied meaning of this word is to convince the audience that all of the subject’s positive actions are merely superficial appearances lacking any real substance. From a forensic perspective, the combination of false factual accusations and this derogatory language constitutes a systematic effort to erode public trust and destroy the subject’s reputation in the digital sphere.

Table 3. Hate Speech and Insults

NO.	Comments	Category	Meaning
7.	@ adferhn1: Bob sanggup gak sih kalo ga sanggup mending mundur aja lah ya (29 November 2025)	Critique of Capabilities	Criticizing and disparaging a public official’s professional capabilities or performance directly, focusing on their competence and suitability for office.
8.	@surianto_siregar: Pencitraan kau, turun aja kalua otak nya gak mampu (28 November 2025)	Intellectual Attack	Declaring the subject intellectually incompetent to perform his or her duties.
9.	@sirumi_hurull: Siapa sih yg milih si90bl09 ini jd pemimpin? Tim joget2 ga guna (29 November 2025)	Credibility Attack	The accusation that all of the subject’s actions are merely a facade lacking any real substance.

3.3 A Form of Hate Speech: “Insult”

The final category identified in the @bobbyst account consists of insults specifically aimed at attacking the subject’s character, abilities, and professional qualifications as a public official. Linguistically, this series of statements carries a primary implicature intended to instill collective doubt regarding the subject’s capabilities and suitability for their current position. The speaker no longer criticizes policies substantively but instead shifts to attempting to prove the subject’s unfitness to hold authority.

Data (7)

“Bob sanggup gak sih kalo ga sanggup mending mundur aja lah ya”
 Sumber: @_adferhn1 Posted on November 27, 2025.

Insulting remarks in the data (7): In this category, comments were found that provocatively urged the subject to *"mundur"* immediately because they were deemed incapable of performing their duties. The use of the phrase *"otaknya gak mampu"* implies that, mentally and intellectually, the subject is deemed to have failed to meet the minimum standards of an ideal leader. Such intellectual attacks aim to undermine the subject’s authority by explicitly declaring their inability to think in a public setting.

Data (8)

“Pencitraan kau, turun aja kalua otak nya gak mampu”
 Sumber: @surianto_siregar Posted on November 28, 2025.

Insulting expressions in the data (8): These insults reach their peak through the use of creative spelling variations and modifications of vulgar words, such as in the term *"si90bl09."* The use of numbers to disguise these insults indicates the speaker’s deliberate effort to continue using extreme insults while attempting to bypass social media censorship filters. Implicitly, the use of this lexicon aims to label the subject as having a very low intelligence level in order to humiliate them in front of a wider audience.

Data (9)

“Siapa sih yg milih si90bl09 ini jd pemimpin? Tim joget2 ga guna”

Sumber: @sirumi_hurull Posted on November 29, 2025.

Derogatory remarks in the data (9): In addition to intellectual attacks, there were also taunts directed at the "*tim joget-joget*" -a term used to refer to the subject's supporters or associates. These remarks reinforce the implication that all the work and actions the subject has undertaken so far are merely superficial displays or gimmicks devoid of substance. Through the narrative of "*ga guna*", the speaker seeks to delegitimize every professional achievement of the subject and steer public opinion toward the notion that the subject prioritizes visual image over actual performance.

Overall, the series of statements in this category of insults demonstrates a clear transition from criticism of public policy toward systematic personal attacks. In forensic linguistic analysis, this phenomenon can be categorized as an act that seriously undermines a person's dignity, as the attacks are not based on valid or verifiable facts. Collectively, these statements have the potential to constitute the criminal offense of defamation, as their primary focus is on damaging the subject's character and credibility-both as an individual and as a public official.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of a forensic linguistic analysis of the comments section on Bobby Nasution's Instagram account, it can be concluded that there is a pattern of language use systematically constructed to undermine the subject's dignity and credibility through three main typologies: the use of taboo words, slander, and professional insults. The use of coarse insults and taboo words such as "*TOLOL*", "*babi*", and the sexual slang "*lontemu*" indicates an attempt at dehumanization and an expression of deep hatred aimed at causing an emotional shock while simultaneously rejecting the subject's very existence. Additionally, strategies to delegitimize authority through slander and defamation were identified, where the speaker made unsubstantiated accusations regarding corruption, abuse of power related to forest destruction, and labeling the subject as a "*boneka*" to undermine legal integrity and public trust.

These attacks are compounded by insults targeting the subject's intellectual capabilities, casting doubt on their suitability as a public official. This includes the use of creative spelling variations such as "*si90bl09*" to circumvent censorship, as well as the taunt "*tim joget-joget*" implying that the subject's performance is nothing more than a gimmick devoid of substance. Forensically, this phenomenon reflects a transition from policy criticism to structured character assassination, where the speaker's malicious intent manifests in personal attacks not grounded in valid facts, thereby potentially fulfilling the elements of the criminal offense of defamation.

References

- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Datang, F. A. (2023). *Linguistik Forensik: Teori dan Praktik*. PT Pemuda Bangsa. (Atau publikasi terkait dalam ranah seminar/jurnal). <https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?user=Y70oU8sAAAAJ>
- Davidson, T., Warmesley, D., Macy, M., & Weber, I. (2017). Automated Hate Speech Detection and the Problem of Offensive Language. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, 11(1), 512-515. <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/ICWSM/article/view/14955>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press. (Penting untuk analisis konteks dan makna implikatur).
- Hutabarat, K. D. (2025). Ujaran Kebencian pada Kolom Komentar Media Sosial Akun Instagram Anies Baswedan. *Kande: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1).
- Juita, N., et al. (2022). Analisis Linguistik Forensik terhadap Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*. <https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jbs/index>

- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- McMenamin, G. R. (2002). *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*. CRC Press. Mahsun. (2023). *Linguistik Forensik: Memahami Forensik Berbasis Teks dengan Analogi DNA*. Depok: Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Mulyanto, A., Nuraeni, A., & Maulani, S. M. (2023). Bentuk dan Jenis Komunikasi Bernada Ujaran Kebencian (Studi Kasus terhadap Postingan dan Komentar Pada Akun Instagram @Nyinyir_Update_Official). *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 12(1), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v12i1.5583>, <https://jurnal.kominfo.go.id/index.php/jkk/index>
- Ningrum, D. J., Suryadi, S., & Wardhana, D. E. C. (2018). Kajian ujaran kebencian di media sosial. *Jurnal Ilmiah KORPUS*, 2(3), 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jik.v2i3.6740>
- Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics: Second Edition*. London: Continuum.
- Olsson, J., & Luchjenbroers, J. (2014). *Forensic Linguistics*. (3rd Ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. <https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/forensic-linguistics-9781472569578/>
- Pinker, S. (2007). *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature*. Penguin. Ramdan, A. (2018). "Kajian Linguistik Forensik terhadap Pencemaran Nama Baik di Media Sosial". *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*. (Relevan dengan bagian pembahasan pencemaran nama baik dan fitnah).
- Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.
- Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.
- Safitri, S., & Sanubarianto, S. T. (2025). Ujaran Kebencian Netizen terhadap Akun Instagram Nikita Mirzani Kajian Pragmatik. *SAWERIGADING*, 31(2), 484–493. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26499/sawer.v31i2.1320>
- Saifullah, A. R. (2025). *Linguistik Forensik di Era Digital*. Bumi Aksara.
- Subyantoro (2019). *inguistik Forensik: Sumbangsih Linguistik dalam Penyelesaian Masalah Hukum*. Remaja Rosdakarya. *Adil indonesia jurnal volume 1 nomor 1, januari 2019*. 1(3), 51–60. <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=1189953>
- Suryani, Y., Istianingrum, R., & Hanik, S. U. (2021). Linguistik Forensik Ujaran Kebencian terhadap Artis Aurel Hermansyah di Media Sosial Instagram. *BELAJAR BAHASA: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.32528/bb.v6i1.4167>
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2017). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/An-Introduction-to-Forensic-Linguistics-Language-in-Evidence/Coulthard-Johnson-Wright/p/book/9781138641716>
- Wibowo, A. S. (2019). "Disfemisme dalam Kolom Komentar Media Sosial: Kajian Linguistik Forensik". *Linguistics and Forensic Science Journal*.
- Yudarwati, G. A. (2019). Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial: Analisis Komunikasi dan Hukum. *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi*, 7(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jkk.v7i1.20141>